

## HEARING PSEUDOCONVEXITY WITH THE KOHN LAPLACIAN

SIQI FU

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Mark Kac's famous question “Can one hear the shape of a drum?” asks whether the spectrum of the Dirichlet Laplacian determines a planar domain up to congruence [Ka66]. This question was answered negatively by Gordon, Webb, and Wolpert(cf. [GWW92]). It has inspired a tremendous amount of research on the interplay of the spectrum of differential operators and the geometry of ambient spaces. Here we study the several complex variables analogue of Kac's question: To what extent is the geometry of a bounded domain  $\Omega$  in  $\mathbb{C}^n$  determined by the spectrum of the  $\bar{\partial}$ -Neumann and Kohn Laplacians? Since the work of Kohn [Ko63, Ko64], it has been discovered that various notions of regularity of the  $\bar{\partial}$ -Neumann and Kohn Laplacians, such as subellipticity, hypoellipticity, and compactness, are intimately related to the boundary geometry of the domain. (See, for example, the surveys [BSt99, Ch99, DK99, FS01].) It is then natural to expect that one should be able to “hear” more about the geometry of a bounded domain in  $\mathbb{C}^n$  with the  $\bar{\partial}$ -Neumann and Kohn Laplacians than with the usual Dirichlet Laplacians. In this paper, we prove the following:

**Theorem 1.1.** *Let  $\Omega$  be a bounded domain in  $\mathbb{C}^n$ ,  $n > 1$ , with connected Lipschitz boundary  $b\Omega$ . Let  $\square_{b,q}$  be the Kohn Laplacian on  $L^2_{(0,q)}(b\Omega)$ . Let  $\text{esspec}(\square_{b,q})$  be the essential spectrum of  $\square_{b,q}$ . If  $\inf \text{esspec}(\square_{b,q}) > 0$  for all  $1 \leq q \leq n-1$ , then  $\Omega$  is pseudoconvex.*

It was shown by Kohn [Ko86] that on smooth pseudoconvex boundaries  $b\Omega$  in Stein manifolds,  $\bar{\partial}_b$  has closed range in  $L^2_{(0,q)}(b\Omega)$  for all  $1 \leq q \leq n-1$ . Independently, Shaw [Sh85] (for  $1 \leq q \leq n-2$ ) and Boas-Shaw [BSh86] (for  $q = n-1$ ) established  $L^2$ -existence theorems for the  $\bar{\partial}_b$ -operator on smooth pseudoconvex boundaries in  $\mathbb{C}^n$ . Recently, Shaw [Sh03] extended these results to pseudoconvex Lipschitz boundaries. In light of these results and Theorem 1.1, for connected and sufficiently smooth boundaries in  $\mathbb{C}^n$ , pseudoconvexity is characterized by positivity of the infimum of the spectrum (or the essential spectrum) of the Kohn Laplacians on all  $(0, q)$ -forms,  $1 \leq q \leq n-1$ .

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we recall necessary setups and definitions. Section 3 contains the proof of Theorem 1.1. Further remarks are given in Section 4.

**Acknowledgment:** Part of this work was done while the author visited Princeton University on an AMS Centennial Research Fellowship. The author is indebted to Professors J. J. Kohn, M.-C. Shaw, and Y.-T. Siu for helpful conversations and kind encouragement.

---

*Date:* February, 2004.

The author was supported in part by NSF grant DMS 0070697 and by an AMS centennial fellowship.

## 2. PRELIMINARIES

We first review the well-known operator theoretic setup (cf. [H65, FK72]). Let  $T_k: H_k \rightarrow H_{k+1}$ ,  $k = 1, 2$ , be densely defined, closed operators between Hilbert spaces. Assume that  $\mathcal{R}(T_1) \subset \mathcal{N}(T_2)$ , where  $\mathcal{R}$  and  $\mathcal{N}$  denote the range and kernel of the operators. Let  $T_k^*$  be the Hilbert space adjoint of  $T_k$ . Then  $T_k^*$  is also densely defined and closed. Let

$$Q(u, v) = (T_1^* u, T_1^* v) + (T_2 u, T_2 v)$$

with  $\text{Dom}(Q) = \text{Dom}(T_1^*) \cap \text{Dom}(T_2)$ . It is easy to see that  $Q(u, v)$  is a non-negative, densely defined, closed sesquilinear form on  $H_2$ . It follows that  $Q(u, v)$  uniquely determines a non-negative, densely defined, self-adjoint operator  $\square$  on  $H_2$  such that  $\text{Dom}(\square^{1/2}) = \text{Dom}(Q)$  and  $Q(u, v) = (\square u, v)$  for all  $u \in \text{Dom}(\square)$  and  $v \in \text{Dom}(Q)$ . (We refer the reader to [D95, K76, RS] for detail on sesquilinear forms and self-adjoint operators.) The spectrum  $\text{spec}(\square)$  of  $\square$  is a non-empty closed subset of  $[0, \infty)$  and the infimum of the spectrum is given by

$$\inf \text{spec}(\square) = \inf \{Q(u, u); u \in \text{Dom}(Q), \|u\| = 1\}.$$

For any positive integer  $j$ , let

$$\lambda_j = \sup_{v_1, \dots, v_{j-1} \in \text{Dom}(Q)} \inf \{Q(u, u); u \in \text{Dom}(Q), u \perp v_i, 1 \leq i \leq j-1, \|u\| = 1\}.$$

Then  $\square$  has compact resolvent if and only if  $\lambda_j \rightarrow \infty$ . In this case,  $\lambda_j$  is the  $j^{\text{th}}$  eigenvalue of  $\square$ , when the eigenvalues are arranged in increasing order and repeated according to multiplicity. If  $\square$  has non-compact resolvent (equivalently, the essential spectrum  $\text{esspec}(\square)$  is non-empty),  $\lambda_j$  is either an eigenvalue of finite multiplicity or the bottom of  $\text{esspec}(\square)$ . In either cases,  $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_j = \inf \text{esspec}(\square)$ . In what follows, we will set  $\inf \text{esspec}(\square) = \infty$  when  $\text{esspec}(\square)$  is empty.

**Lemma 2.1.** *With the above notations and assumptions,  $\inf \text{spec}(\square) > 0$  if and only if  $\mathcal{R}(T_2)$  is closed and  $\mathcal{R}(T_1) = \mathcal{N}(T_2)$ . Furthermore,  $\inf \text{esspec}(\square) > 0$  if and only if there exists a finite dimensional subspace  $L \subset \text{Dom}(Q)$  such that  $\mathcal{R}(T_2|_{L^\perp})$  is closed and  $\mathcal{R}(T_1) \cap L^\perp = \mathcal{N}(T_2) \cap L^\perp$ .*

The first part of the lemma is well-known (compare [H65], Theorem 1.1.2; [C83], Proposition 3; and [Sh92], Proposition 2.3). We provide a proof here for completeness. To prove the forward direction, we note that  $\inf \text{spec}(\square) > 0$  implies that  $\square$  has a bounded inverse  $N$  defined on all  $H_2$ . Hence each  $u \in H_2$  has an orthogonal decomposition  $u = T_1 T_1^* N u + T_2^* T_2 N u$ . It follows that  $\mathcal{R}(T_1) = \mathcal{N}(T_2)$  and  $\mathcal{R}(T_2^*) = \mathcal{N}(T_1^*)$ . Since now  $T_2^*$  has closed range, so is  $T_2$ . We thus conclude the prove of forward direction. To prove the opposite, for any  $u \in \text{Dom}(Q)$ , we write  $u = u_1 + u_2$  where  $u_1 \in \text{Dom}(Q) \cap \mathcal{N}(T_2)$  and  $u_2 \in \text{Dom}(Q) \cap \mathcal{N}(T_2)^\perp$ . Since  $\mathcal{N}(T_2) = \mathcal{R}(T_1) = \mathcal{N}(T_1^*)^\perp$  and  $\mathcal{N}(T_2)^\perp = \mathcal{R}(T_1)^\perp = \mathcal{N}(T_1^*)$ , there exists a positive constant  $C$  such that  $\|u\|^2 = \|u_1\|^2 + \|u_2\|^2 \leq C(\|T_1^* u_1\|^2 + \|T_2 u_2\|^2) = CQ(u, u)$ . This concludes the proof of the backward direction.

For a proof of the second part of the lemma, we observe that by the above-mentioned spectral theoretic results,  $\inf \text{esspec}(\square) > 0$  if and only if there exists a positive constant  $C$  and a finite dimensional subspace  $L$  of  $\text{Dom}(Q)$  such that

$$Q(u, u) \geq C\|u\|^2, \quad u \in \text{Dom}(Q) \cap L^\perp.$$

To prove the forward direction, let  $H'_2 = H_2 \ominus L$  and let  $T'_2 = T_2|_{H'_2}$  and  $T_1^{*\prime} = T_1^*|_{H'_2}$ . Then  $T'_2: H'_2 \rightarrow H_3$  and  $T_1^{*\prime}: H'_2 \rightarrow H_1$  are densely defined, closed operators. Let  $T'_1: H_1 \rightarrow H'_2$  be the adjoint of  $T_1^{*\prime}$ . It is easy to see that  $\mathcal{R}(T'_1) \subset \mathcal{N}(T'_2)$  and  $\text{Dom}(T'_1) = \text{Dom}(T_1)$ .

Applying the first part of the lemma to the operators  $T'_1: H_1 \rightarrow H'_2$  and  $T'_2: H'_2 \rightarrow H_3$  and the sesquilinear form

$$Q'(u, v) = (T'_1{}^* u, T'_1{}^* v) + (T'_2 u, T'_2 v)$$

on  $H'_2$  with  $\text{Dom}(Q') = \text{Dom}(Q) \cap L^\perp$ , we obtain that  $T'_1$  and  $T'_2$  have closed range and  $\mathcal{R}(T'_1) = \mathcal{N}(T'_2)$ . We then conclude the proof of the forward direction by noting that  $\mathcal{R}(T'_1) = \mathcal{R}(T_1) \cap L^\perp$  and  $\mathcal{N}(T'_2) = \mathcal{N}(T_2) \cap L^\perp$ . The converse is treated similarly as above and is left to the reader.

**Remark.** Let  $\tilde{H}_2 = \mathcal{N}(T_1^*)^\perp$ . Let  $\tilde{T}_1^* = T_1^*|_{\tilde{H}_2}$  and let  $\tilde{Q}(u, v) = (\tilde{T}_1^* u, \tilde{T}_1^* v)$  be the sesquilinear form on  $\tilde{H}_2$  with  $\text{Dom}(\tilde{Q}) = \text{Dom}(T_1^*) \cap \tilde{H}_2$ . Let  $\tilde{\square}$  be the self-adjoint operator determined by  $\tilde{Q}(u, v)$ . In this case,  $\inf \text{spec}(\tilde{\square}) > 0$  if and only if  $\mathcal{R}(T_1) = \mathcal{N}(T_1^*)^\perp$ , and  $\inf \text{esspec}(\tilde{\square}) > 0$  if and only if there exists a finite dimensional subspace  $L$  of  $\tilde{H}_2$  such that  $\mathcal{R}(T_1) \cap L^\perp = L^\perp$ .

We now review the  $\bar{\partial}_b$ -complex as introduced by Kohn [Ko65, KR65], and adapted to Lipschitz boundaries by Shaw [Sh03]. Let  $\Omega$  be a bounded Lipschitz domain in  $\mathbb{C}^n$ . (Recall that  $b\Omega$  is Lipschitz if it is given locally by a Lipschitz graph.) Let  $\rho \in \text{Lip}(\mathbb{C}^n)$  be a defining function of  $b\Omega$  such that  $\rho < 0$  on  $\Omega$  and  $C_1 \leq |d\rho| \leq C_2$  a.e. on  $b\Omega$  for some positive constants  $C_1$  and  $C_2$  (cf. [Sh03]). Let  $I^{0,q}$ ,  $0 \leq q \leq n$ , be the ideal in  $\Lambda^{0,q}T^*(\mathbb{C}^n)$  generated by  $\rho$  and  $\bar{\partial}\rho$ . Let  $\Lambda^{0,q}T^*(b\Omega)$  be the orthogonal complement with respect to the standard Euclidean metric of  $I^{0,q}|_{b\Omega}$  in  $\Lambda^{0,q}T^*(\mathbb{C}^n)|_{b\Omega}$ . Let  $\tau: \Lambda^{0,q}T^*(\mathbb{C}^n)|_{b\Omega} \rightarrow \Lambda^{0,q}T^*(b\Omega)$  be the orthogonal projection.

Let  $L^2_{(0,q)}(b\Omega)$  be the space of  $(0, q)$ -forms with  $L^2$ -coefficients, equipped with the induced Euclidean metric on  $b\Omega$ ; that is, the projections under  $\tau$  of  $(0, q)$ -forms on  $\mathbb{C}^n$  whose coefficients are in  $L^2(b\Omega)$  when restricted to  $b\Omega$ . The operator  $\bar{\partial}_{b,q}: L^2_{(0,q)}(b\Omega) \rightarrow L^2_{(0,q+1)}(b\Omega)$ ,  $0 \leq q \leq n-1$ , defined in the sense of distribution as the restriction of  $\bar{\partial}_q$  to the boundary  $b\Omega$ , is densely defined and closed (see [Sh03]). Let  $\bar{\partial}_{b,q}^*$  be the Hilbert space adjoint of  $\bar{\partial}_{b,q}$ . Let

$$Q_{b,q}(u, v) = (\bar{\partial}_{b,q}u, \bar{\partial}_{b,q}v) + (\bar{\partial}_{b,q-1}^*u, \bar{\partial}_{b,q-1}^*v)$$

with  $\text{Dom}(Q_{b,q}) = \text{Dom}(\bar{\partial}_{b,q}) \cap \text{Dom}(\bar{\partial}_{b,q-1}^*)$  when  $1 \leq q \leq n-2$ , and let

$$Q_{b,n-1}(u, v) = (\bar{\partial}_{b,n-2}^*u, \bar{\partial}_{b,n-2}^*v)$$

with  $\text{Dom}(Q_{b,n-1}) = \text{Dom}(\bar{\partial}_{b,n-2}^*) \cap \mathcal{N}(\bar{\partial}_{b,n-2}^*)^\perp$ . Then  $Q_{b,q}$ ,  $1 \leq q \leq n-1$ , are non-negative, closed, and densely defined sesquilinear forms on  $L^2_{(0,q)}(b\Omega)$ . Therefore it uniquely determines a non-negative, closed, densely defined, and self-adjoint operator  $\square_{b,q}$  on  $L^2_{(0,q)}(b\Omega)$  such that  $\text{Dom}(\square_{b,q}^{1/2}) = \text{Dom}(Q_{b,q})$  and  $Q_{b,q}(u, v) = (\square_{b,q}u, v)$  for all  $u \in \text{Dom}(\square_{b,q})$  and  $v \in \text{Dom}(Q_{b,q})$ . The Kohn Laplacian is formally given by  $\square_{b,q} = \bar{\partial}_{b,q-1}\bar{\partial}_{b,q-1}^* + \bar{\partial}_{b,q}^*\bar{\partial}_{b,q}$  for  $1 \leq q \leq n-2$  and  $\square_{b,n-1} = \bar{\partial}_{b,n-2}\bar{\partial}_{b,n-2}^*|_{\mathcal{N}(\bar{\partial}_{b,n-2}^*)^\perp}$ . (Notice that on top degree  $(0, n-1)$ -forms, the Kohn Laplacian here is the restriction to the orthogonal complement of  $\mathcal{N}(\bar{\partial}_{b,n-2}^*)$  of the usual Kohn Laplacian. We make this restriction because the kernel of  $\bar{\partial}_{b,n-2}^*$  is infinite dimensional.) We refer the reader to the monographs [FK72] and [CS01] for detail on the subject.

## 3. PROOF OF THE MAIN THEOREM

Let  $\rho \in \text{Lip}(\mathbb{C}^n)$  be a global defining function of  $\Omega$  such that  $\rho < 0$  on  $\Omega$  and  $C_1 \leq |d\rho| \leq C_2$  a.e. on  $b\Omega$ . Arguing via *reductio ad absurdum*, we assume that  $\Omega$  is not pseudoconvex. Then there exists a domain  $\tilde{\Omega} \supsetneq \Omega$  such that every holomorphic function on  $\Omega$  extends holomorphically to  $\tilde{\Omega}$  (cf. [H91]). Since  $b\Omega$  is Lipschitz,  $\tilde{\Omega} \setminus \text{cl}(\Omega)$  is non-empty. After a translation and a unitary transformation, we may assume that the origin is in  $\tilde{\Omega} \setminus \text{cl}(\Omega)$  and the  $z_n$ -axis has a non-empty intersection with  $\Omega$ . Furthermore, we may assume that the positive  $y_n$ -direction is the outward normal direction of the intersection of the  $y_n$ -axis with  $b\Omega$  and  $b\Omega \cap \tilde{\Omega}$  is parameterized near the intersection by  $y_n = h(z_1, \dots, z_{n-1}, x_n)$  for some Lipschitz function  $h$ .

For any integers  $\alpha \geq 0$ ,  $m \geq 1$ , and  $q \geq 1$ , and for any  $\{k_1, \dots, k_{q-1}\} \subset \{1, 2, \dots, n-1\}$ , let

$$u_{\alpha,m}(k_1, \dots, k_q) = \frac{(\alpha+q-1)! \bar{z}_n^{m\alpha} (\bar{z}_{k_1} \cdots \bar{z}_{k_q})^{m-1}}{r_m^{\alpha+q}} \sum_{j=1}^q (-1)^j \bar{z}_{k_j} d\bar{z}_{k_1} \wedge \cdots \wedge \widehat{d\bar{z}_{k_j}} \wedge \cdots \wedge d\bar{z}_{k_q}$$

where  $k_q = n$ ,  $r_m = |z_1|^{2m} + \cdots + |z_n|^{2m}$ , and  $\widehat{d\bar{z}_{k_j}}$  indicates as usual the omission of  $d\bar{z}_{k_j}$  from the wedge product. It is evident that  $u_{\alpha,m}(k_1, \dots, k_q)$  is a smooth  $(0, q-1)$ -form on  $\mathbb{C}^n \setminus \{0\}$  that is skew-symmetric with respect to the indices  $(k_1, \dots, k_{q-1})$ . In particular,  $u_{\alpha,m}(k_1, \dots, k_q) = 0$  when two  $k_j$ 's are identical. Write  $K = (k_1, \dots, k_q)$ ,  $d\bar{z}_K = d\bar{z}_{k_1} \wedge \cdots \wedge d\bar{z}_{k_q}$ ,  $\bar{z}_K^{m-1} = (\bar{z}_{k_1} \cdots \bar{z}_{k_q})^{m-1}$ , and  $\widehat{d\bar{z}_K} = d\bar{z}_{k_1} \wedge \cdots \wedge \widehat{d\bar{z}_{k_j}} \wedge \cdots \wedge d\bar{z}_{k_q}$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\partial} u_{\alpha,m}(k_1, \dots, k_q) &= -\frac{(\alpha+q)! m \bar{z}_n^{m\alpha} \bar{z}_K^{m-1}}{r_m^{\alpha+q+1}} (r_m d\bar{z}_K + \left( \sum_{\ell=1}^n \bar{z}_\ell^{m-1} z_\ell^m d\bar{z}_\ell \right) \wedge \left( \sum_{j=1}^q (-1)^j \bar{z}_{k_j} \widehat{d\bar{z}_{k_j}} \right)) \\ &= -\frac{(\alpha+q)! m \bar{z}_n^{m\alpha} \bar{z}_K^{m-1}}{r_m^{\alpha+q+1}} \sum_{\ell \in \{1, \dots, n\} \setminus \{k_1, \dots, k_q\}} z_\ell^m \bar{z}_\ell^{m-1} \left( \bar{z}_\ell d\bar{z}_K + \sum_{j=1}^q (-1)^j \bar{z}_{k_j} \widehat{d\bar{z}_{k_j}} \right) \\ &= m \sum_{\ell=1}^{n-1} z_\ell^m u_{\alpha,m}(\ell, k_1, \dots, k_q). \end{aligned}$$

In particular,  $u_{\alpha,m}(1, \dots, n)$  is  $\bar{\partial}$ -closed. Let  $N = (1/|\partial\rho|) \sum_{j=1}^n \rho_{z_j} \partial/\partial\bar{z}_j$  and let

$$u_{\alpha,m}^b(k_1, \dots, k_q) = \tau(u_{\alpha,m}(1, 2, \dots, n)) = N \lrcorner \left( \frac{\bar{\partial}\rho}{|\bar{\partial}\rho|} \wedge u_{\alpha,m}(k_1, \dots, k_q) \right) \in L^2_{(0,q-1)}(b\Omega),$$

where  $\lrcorner$  denotes the contraction operator. Then for  $1 \leq q \leq n-1$ ,

$$\bar{\partial}_{b,q-1} u_{\alpha,m}^b(k_1, \dots, k_q) = m \sum_{\ell=1}^{n-1} z_\ell^m u_{\alpha,m}^b(\ell, k_1, \dots, k_q).$$

We now show that  $u_{\alpha,m}^b(1, 2, \dots, n) \perp \mathcal{N}(\bar{\partial}_{b,n-1}^*)$ . Let  $\star: L^2_{(p,q)}(\Omega) \rightarrow L^2_{(n-p,n-q)}(\Omega)$  be the Hodge star operator, defined by  $\langle \phi, \psi \rangle dV = \phi \wedge \star \psi$  where  $dV$  is the Euclidean volume form. Let  $v \in \mathcal{N}(\bar{\partial}_{b,n-1}^*)$ . Let  $\theta = \star(dz_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge dz_n \wedge \bar{\partial}\rho/|\bar{\partial}\rho|)$ . Then  $v = \bar{f}\theta$  for some  $f \in L^2(b\Omega)$  with  $\bar{\partial}_b f = 0$ . It follows from a version of Hartogs-Bochner extension theorem that there exists a holomorphic function  $F$  on  $\Omega$  such that the non-tangential limit of  $F$

agrees with  $f$  a.e. on  $b\Omega$ , and

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \int_{b\Omega} |F(z - \epsilon\nu(z)) - f(z)|^2 d\sigma = 0$$

where  $\nu(z) = \nabla\rho/|\nabla\rho|$ . (See, for example, Theorem 7.1 in [Ky95]. Although the theorem is stated only for  $C^1$ -smooth boundaries, the proof works for Lipschitz boundaries with only minor modifications.) Let  $\nu_\delta(z)$  be the convolution of  $\nu(z)$  with appropriate Friederichs' mollifiers. Then there exists a subsequence  $\delta_j \rightarrow 0$  such that  $\nu_{\delta_j}(z) \rightarrow \nu(z)$  a.e. on  $b\Omega$ . Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} (u_{\alpha,m}^b(1, \dots, n), v) &= \int_{b\Omega} f(z) u_{\alpha,m}^b(1, \dots, n)(z) \wedge dz_1 \dots \wedge dz_n \\ &= \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_{b\Omega} F(z - \epsilon\nu(z)) u_{\alpha,m}^b(1, \dots, n)(z) \wedge dz_1 \dots \wedge dz_n \\ &= \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \lim_{\delta_j \rightarrow 0} \int_{b\Omega} F(z - \epsilon\nu_{\delta_j}(z)) u_{\alpha,m}^b(1, \dots, n)(z) \wedge dz_1 \dots \wedge dz_n \\ &= \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \lim_{\delta_j \rightarrow 0} \int_{\Omega} \bar{\partial}(F(z - \epsilon\nu_{\delta_j}(z)) u_{\alpha,m}^b(1, \dots, n)(z) \wedge dz_1 \dots \wedge dz_n) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Hence  $u_{\alpha,m}^b(1, \dots, n) \perp \mathcal{N}(\bar{\partial}_{b,n-1}^*)$  as claimed.

By Lemma 2.1 and the subsequence remark, we can choose a sufficiently large positive integer  $M$  such that there exist subspaces  $S_q$  of  $\text{Dom}(Q_{b,q})$  for  $1 \leq q \leq n-2$  and  $S_{n-1}$  of  $\mathcal{N}(\bar{\partial}_{b,n-2}^*)^\perp$ , all of which have dimensions  $< M$  and satisfy  $\mathcal{R}(\bar{\partial}_{b,q-1}) \cap S_q^\perp = \mathcal{N}(\bar{\partial}_{b,q}) \cap S_q^\perp$ ,  $1 \leq q \leq n-2$ , and  $\mathcal{R}(\bar{\partial}_{b,n-2}) \cap S_{n-1}^\perp = S_{n-1}^\perp$ . Fix  $m \geq 1$  (to be specified later) and let  $\mathcal{F}_0$  be the linear span of  $\{u_{\alpha,m}^b(1, \dots, n); \alpha = 1, \dots, M^{n-1}\}$ . For any  $u \in \mathcal{F}_0$  and for any  $\{k_1, \dots, k_{q-1}\} \subset \{1, \dots, n-1\}$ , we set

$$u(k_1, \dots, k_{q-1}, n) = \sum_{j=1}^k c_j u_{\alpha_j, m}^b(k_1, \dots, k_{q-1}, n)$$

if  $u = \sum_{j=1}^k c_j u_{\alpha_j, m}^b(1, \dots, n)$ . We decompose  $\mathcal{F}_0$  into a direct sum of  $M^{n-2}$  subspaces, each of which is  $M$ -dimensional. Since  $\dim(S_{n-1}) < M$  and  $u_{\alpha,m}(1, \dots, n) \in \mathcal{N}(\bar{\partial}_{b,n-2}^*)^\perp$ , there exists a non-zero form  $u$  in each of the subspaces such that  $\bar{\partial}_b v_u(\emptyset) = u$  for some  $v_u(\emptyset) \in L^2_{(0,n-2)}(b\Omega)$ . Let  $\mathcal{F}_1$  be the  $M^{n-2}$ -dimensional linear span of all such  $u$ 's. We extend  $u \mapsto v_u(\emptyset)$  linearly to all  $u \in \mathcal{F}_1$ .

For  $0 \leq q \leq n-1$ , we use induction on  $q$  to construct an  $M^{n-q-2}$ -dimensional subspace  $\mathcal{F}_{q+1}$  of  $\mathcal{F}_q$  with the properties that for any  $u \in \mathcal{F}_{q+1}$ , there exists  $v_u(k_1, \dots, k_q) \in L^2_{(0,n-q-2)}(b\Omega)$  for all  $\{k_1, \dots, k_q\} \subset \{1, \dots, n-1\}$  such that

- (1)  $v_u(k_1, \dots, k_q)$  depends linearly on  $u$ .
- (2)  $v_u(k_1, \dots, k_q)$  is skew-symmetric with respect to indices  $K = (k_1, \dots, k_q)$ .
- (3)  $\bar{\partial}_b v_u(K) = m \sum_{j=1}^q (-1)^j z_{k_j}^m v_u(K; \hat{k}_j) + (-1)^{q+|K|} u(1, \dots, n; \hat{K})$  where  $|K| = k_1 + \dots + k_q$ . The hat  $\hat{\cdot}$  indicates deletion of indices beneath it from the indices preceding the semicolon in the same enclosing parenthesis.

We now show how to construct  $\mathcal{F}_{q+1}$  and  $v_u(k_1, \dots, k_q)$  for  $u \in \mathcal{F}_{q+1}$  and  $\{k_1, \dots, k_q\} \subset \{1, \dots, n-1\}$  once  $\mathcal{F}_q$  has been constructed. For any  $u \in \mathcal{F}_q$  and any  $\{k_1, \dots, k_q\} \subset$

$\{1, \dots, n-1\}$ , write  $K = (k_1, \dots, k_q)$ , and let

$$w_u(K) = m \sum_{j=1}^q (-1)^j z_{k_j}^m v_u(K; \hat{k}_j) + (-1)^{q+|K|} u(1, \dots, n; \hat{K}).$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\partial}_b w_u(K) &= m \sum_{j=1}^q (-1)^j z_{k_j}^m \bar{\partial}_b v_u(K; \hat{k}_j) + (-1)^{q+|K|} \bar{\partial}_b u(1, \dots, n; \hat{K}) \\ &= m \sum_{j=1}^q (-1)^j z_{k_j}^m \left( m \sum_{1 \leq i < j} (-1)^i z_{k_i}^m v_u(K; \hat{k}_j, \hat{k}_i) + m \sum_{j < i \leq q} (-1)^{i-1} z_{k_i}^m v_u(K; \hat{k}_j, \hat{k}_i) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - (-1)^{q+|K|-k_j} u(1, \dots, n; \widehat{(K; \hat{k}_j)}) \right) + (-1)^{q+|K|} \bar{\partial}_b u(1, \dots, n; \hat{K}) \\ &= (-1)^{q+|K|} \left( -m \sum_{j=1}^q (-1)^{j-k_j} z_{k_j}^m u(1, \dots, n; \widehat{(K; \hat{k}_j)}) + \bar{\partial}_b u(1, \dots, n; \hat{K}) \right) \\ &= (-1)^{q+|K|} \left( -m \sum_{j=1}^q z_{k_j}^m u(k_j, (1, \dots, n; \hat{K})) + \bar{\partial}_b u(1, \dots, n; \hat{K}) \right) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

We again decompose  $\mathcal{F}_q$  into a direct sum of  $M^{n-q-2}$  linear subspaces, each of which is  $M$ -dimensional. Since  $\dim(S_{n-q-2}) < M$  and  $\bar{\partial}_b w_u(K) = 0$ , there exists a non-zero form  $u$  in each of these subspaces such that  $\bar{\partial}_b v_u(K) = w_u(K)$  for some  $v_u(K) \in L^2_{(0, n-q-2)}(b\Omega)$ . Since  $w_u(K)$  is skew-symmetric with respect to indices  $K$ , we may choose  $v_u(K)$  to be skew-symmetric with respect to  $K$  as well. The subspace  $\mathcal{F}_{q+1}$  of  $\mathcal{F}_q$  is then the linear span of all such  $u$ 's.

Note that  $\dim(\mathcal{F}_{n-1}) = 1$ . Let  $u$  be any non-zero form in  $\mathcal{F}_{n-1}$  and let

$$g = w_u(1, \dots, n-1) = m \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} z_j^m v_u(1, \dots, \hat{j}, \dots, n-1) - (-1)^{n+\frac{n(n-1)}{2}} u(n).$$

Then  $g \in L^2(b\Omega)$  and  $\bar{\partial}_b g = 0$ . Therefore,  $g$  has a holomorphic extension  $G$  to  $\Omega$  such that the non-tangential limit of  $G$  agrees with  $g$  a.e. on  $b\Omega$  (cf. Theorem 7.1 in [Ky95]). By the *reductio ad absurdum* assumption,  $G$  extends holomorphically to  $\tilde{\Omega}$ . Write  $z' = (z_1, \dots, z_{n-1})$ . For sufficiently small  $\varepsilon > 0$  and  $\delta > 0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{|x_n| < \varepsilon, |z'| < \varepsilon} \left| (G + (-1)^{n+\frac{n(n-1)}{2}} u(n))(\delta z', x_n + ih(\delta z', x_n)) \right| dV(z') dx_n \\ &\leq m \delta^m \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \int_{|x_n| < \varepsilon, |z'| < \varepsilon} |z_j|^m |v_u(1, \dots, \hat{j}, \dots, n-1)(\delta z', x_n + ih(\delta z', x_n))| dV(z') dx_n \\ &\leq m \delta^{m-2(n-1)} \varepsilon^m \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \|v_u(1, \dots, \hat{j}, \dots, n-1)\|_{L^1(b\Omega)}. \end{aligned}$$

Choosing  $m > 2(n-1)$  and letting  $\delta \rightarrow 0$ , we obtain

$$G(0, x_n + ih(0, x_n)) = -(-1)^{n+\frac{n(n-1)}{2}} u(n)(0, x_n + ih(0, x_n)).$$

However,  $u(n)(0, z_n)$  is a non-trivial linear combination of functions of form  $1/z^k$  with  $k$  a positive integer. This leads to a contradiction with the analyticity of  $G$  near the origin. We therefore conclude the proof of Theorem 1.1.

#### 4. FURTHER REMARKS

(1) The analogue of Theorem 1.1 for the  $\bar{\partial}$ -Neumann Laplacian  $\square_q$  also holds under the assumption that  $\text{int}(\text{cl}(\Omega)) = \Omega$ . This is a consequence of the sheaf cohomology theory (see [S53, L66, O88]), in light of Lemma 2.1. (We thank Professor Y.-T. Siu for drawing our attention to [L66], by which the construction here is inspired.) The above proof of Theorem 1.1 can be easily modified to give a proof of this  $\bar{\partial}$ -Neumann Laplacian analogue, bypassing sheaf cohomology arguments. In this case, one can actually choose  $m$  to be any positive integer, independent of the dimension  $n$ . The non-elliptic nature of  $\bar{\partial}_b$ -complex seems to require that the  $m$  in the above proof be dependent on  $n$ . It follows from Hörmander's  $L^2$ -existence theorem for the  $\bar{\partial}$ -operator that  $\inf \text{spec}(\square_q) > 0$  for all  $1 \leq q \leq n-1$  for any bounded pseudoconvex domain in  $\mathbb{C}^n$  (see [H65, H91]). Therefore, for a bounded domain  $\Omega$  in  $\mathbb{C}^n$  such that  $\text{int}(\text{cl}(\Omega)) = \Omega$ , the following statements are equivalent:

(a)  $\Omega$  is pseudoconvex; (b)  $\inf \text{spec}(\square_q) > 0$  for all  $1 \leq q \leq n-1$ ; (c)  $\inf \text{esspec}(\square_q) > 0$  for all  $1 \leq q \leq n-1$ .

(2) Let  $\Omega$  be a bounded Lipschitz domain in  $\mathbb{C}^n$  and let  $p \geq 1$ . Consider  $\bar{\partial}_{b,q}: L^p_{(0,q)}(\Omega) \rightarrow L^p_{(0,q+1)}(b\Omega)$ ,  $0 \leq q \leq n-2$ , where  $L^p_{(0,q)}(b\Omega)$  are boundary  $(0, q)$ -forms with  $L^p$ -coefficients. Let  $\mathcal{K}_{n-1}$  be the space of all  $f \in \text{Dom}(\bar{\partial}_{b,n-1})$  such that

$$\int_{b\Omega} f \wedge \alpha = 0$$

for all  $\alpha \in C_{(n,0)}^\infty(\bar{\Omega}) \cap \mathcal{N}(\bar{\partial})$ . Let  $H_q^p(b\Omega) = \mathcal{N}(\bar{\partial}_{b,q})/\mathcal{R}(\bar{\partial}_{b,q-1})$ ,  $1 \leq q \leq n-2$ , and  $H_{n-1}^p(b\Omega) = \mathcal{K}_{n-1}/\mathcal{R}(\bar{\partial}_{b,n-1})$ . Then the proof of Theorem 1.1 implies that  $\Omega$  is pseudoconvex if  $\dim(H_q^p(b\Omega)) < \infty$  for all  $1 \leq q \leq n-1$ .

(3) The generalization to  $(p, q)$ -forms is trivial. We deal with  $(0, q)$ -forms only for economy of notations.

#### REFERENCES

- [BSt99] Harold P. Boas and Emil J. Straube, *Global regularity of the  $\bar{\partial}$ -Neumann problem: a survey of the  $L^2$ -Sobolev theory*, Several Complex Variables (M. Schneider and Y.-T. Siu, eds.), MSRI Publications, vol. 37, 79-112, 1999.
- [BSh86] Harold P. Boas and Mei-Chi Shaw, *Sobolev estimates for the Lewy operator on weakly pseudoconvex boundaries*, Math. Ann. **274** (1986), 221-231.
- [C83] David Catlin, *Necessary conditions for subellipticity of the  $\bar{\partial}$ -Neumann problem*, Ann. Math. **117** (1983), 147-171.
- [CS99] So-Chin Chen and Mei-Chi Shaw, *Partial differential equations in several complex variables*, AMS/IP, 2000.
- [Ch99] Michael Christ, *Remarks on global irregularity in the  $\bar{\partial}$ -Neumann problem*, Several Complex Variables (M. Schneider and Y.-T. Siu, eds.), MSRI Publications, vol. 37, 161-198, 1999.
- [DK99] J. D'Angelo and J. J. Kohn, *Subelliptic estimates and finite type*, Several Complex Variables (M. Schneider and Y.-T. Siu, eds.), MSRI Publications, vol. 37, 199-232, 1999.
- [D95] E. B. Davies, *Spectral theory and differential operators*, Cambridge studeis in advanced mathematics, vol. 42, Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- [FK72] G. B. Folland and J. J. Kohn, *The Neumann problem for the Cauchy-Riemann complex*, Annals of Mathematics Studies, no. 75, Princeton University Press, 1972.

- [FS01] Siqi Fu and Emil J. Straube, *Compactness in the  $\bar{\partial}$ -Neumann problem*, Complex Analysis and Geometry, Proceedings of Ohio State University Conference, vol. 9, 141-160, Walter De Gruyter, 2001.
- [GWW92] C. Gordon, D. Webb, and S. Wolpert, *One cannot hear the shape of a drum*, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. (N.S.) **27** (1992), 134–138.
- [H65] Lars Hörmander,  *$L^2$  estimates and existence theorems for the  $\bar{\partial}$  operator*, Acta Math. **113** (1965), 89–152.
- [H91] \_\_\_\_\_, *An introduction to complex analysis in several variables*, third ed., Elsevier Science Publishing, 1991.
- [Ka66] M. Kac, *Can one hear the shape of a drum?* Amer. Math. Monthly **73** (1966), 1–23.
- [K76] T. Kato, *Perturbation theory for linear operators*, Springer-Verlag, 1976.
- [Ko63] J. J. Kohn, *Harmonic integrals on strongly pseudo-convex manifolds, I*, Ann. Math. **78** (1963), 112–148.
- [Ko64] \_\_\_\_\_, *Harmonic integrals on strongly pseudo-convex manifolds, II*, Ann. Math. **79** (1964), 450–472.
- [Ko65] \_\_\_\_\_, *boundaries of complex manifolds*, Proc. Conf. Complex Manifolds (Minneapolis, 1964), Springer-Verlag, 81-94, 1965.
- [Ko86] \_\_\_\_\_, *The range of the tangential Cauchy-Riemann operator*, Duke Math. Jour. **53** (1986), 525–545.
- [KR65] J. J. Kohn and H. Rossi, *On the extension of holomorphic functions from the boundary of a complex manifold*, Ann. Math. **81** (1965), 451–472.
- [Ky95] Alexander M. Kytmanov, *The Bochner-Martinelli integral and its applications*, Birkhäuser Verlag, 1995.
- [L66] Henry B. Laufer, *On sheaf cohomology and envelopes of holomorphy*, Ann. Math. **84** (1966), 102–118.
- [O88] Takeo Ohsawa, *Complete Kähler manifolds and function theory of several complex variables*, Sugaku Expositions **1** (1988), 75–93.
- [RS] Michael Reed and Barry Simon, *Methods of Modern Mathematical Physics*, vol. I-IV, Academic Press.
- [S53] J.-P. Serre, *Quelques problèmes globaux relatifs aux variétés de Stein*, Colloque sur les Fonctions de Plusieurs Variables, 57–68, Brussels, 1953.
- [Sh85] Mei-Chi Shaw,  *$L^2$  estimates and existence theorems for the tangential Cauchy-Riemann complex*, Invent. Math. **82** (1985), 133–150.
- [Sh92] \_\_\_\_\_, *Local existence theorems with estimates for  $\bar{\partial}_b$  on weakly pseudo-convex CR manifolds*, Math. Ann. **294** (1992), no. 4, 677–700.
- [Sh03] \_\_\_\_\_,  *$L^2$ -estimates and existence theorems for the  $\bar{\partial}_b$  on Lipschitz boundaries*, Math. Z. **244** (2003), 91–123.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, RUTGERS UNIVERSITY-CAMDEN, CAMDEN, NJ 08102  
*E-mail address:* `sfu@camden.rutgers.edu`